




Docket No.: 248270US6

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/767,371

Applicants: Hideyuki SUZUKI

Filing Date: January 30, 2004

For: WIRELESS ADHOC COMMUNICATION SYSTEM,
TERMINAL, AUTHENTICATION METHOD FOR
USE IN TERMINAL, ENCRYPTION METHOD,
TERMINAL MANAGEMENT METHOD, AND
PROGRAM FOR ENABLING TERMINAL TO
PERFORM THOSE METHODS

Group Art Unit: 2687

Examiner: C.T. Shedrick

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

Restriction Response

Our credit card payment form in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

I:\ATTY\SMS\24\sl248270US\PTO CVR.DOC

DOCKET NO: 248270US6



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
HIDEYUKI SUZUKI : EXAMINER: C. T. SHEDRICK
SERIAL NO: 10/767,371 :
FILED: JANUARY 30, 2004 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2687
FOR: WIRELESS ADHOC :
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM,
TERMINAL, AUTHENTICATION
METHOD FOR USE IN TERMINAL,
ENCRYPTION METHOD, TERMINAL
MANAGEMENT METHOD, AND
PROGRAM FOR ENABLING TERMINAL
TO PERFORM THOSE METHODS

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated October 26, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Claims 3-16 (Group II) for examination on the merits in the present Application. Applicants make this election based on the understanding that Applicants are not prejudiced against filing one or more divisional applications that cover the non-elected claims.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement as the outstanding Restriction Requirement has not established that an undue burden would be required if the Restriction Requirement was not issued and if all the claims were examined together. More particularly, MPEP § 803 states the following:

Application No. 10/767,371
Reply to Office Action of October 26, 2005


If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

In the present application no undue burden has been established if each of the claims were examined together. In contrast, the present restriction requirement subjects the Applicants to the added financial burden of prosecuting Claims 1-2 and Claims 3-16 in separate proceedings.

An early and favorable examination of the elected claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\SMS\24'S\248270US\REST RESP.DOC